

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-52 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 39, 42, 44-46, 49 and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication Number 20020094806 to Kamimura.

Claims 40, 41, 43, 47, 48 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura in view of U.S. Publication Number 20020029246 to Kumagai.

Claims 11-13, 17-19, 30-32 and 36-38 were allowed.

II. Reconsideration of Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Applicants' assertion that examination of all the claims does not impose a serious burden is not found persuasive because the claimed inventions have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects. The Examiner further asserted that the different inventions are distinct, each from the other because each group has different functions, i.e., different parameters, for detecting a telephone number stored in a log deleting management database.

Applicants respectfully request a reconsideration of the restriction requirement. Applicants submit that there is a significant degree of common subject matter in Groups I, II and III identified by the Examiner. For example, each group accesses a log deleting management database of a mobile phone and records a telephone number in the log deleting management database of the mobile phone. Particularly, Group I is directed to selecting and displaying a log deleting management database from a menu of the mobile phone, determining whether a telephone number stored in the log deleting management database should be recorded in a secret received number list and recording a new telephone number from the log deleting management

database. Group II is directed to displaying a log deleting management database from a menu of the mobile phone, determining whether a received telephone number is included in the stored numbers in the log deleting management database, and recoding the number in a secret received number list. Group III is directed to displaying a log deleting management database from a menu of the mobile phone, determining whether an input telephone number is included in the stored numbers in the log deleting management database, and recoding the input number in a recently dialed number list. Applicants submit that inventions as claimed are independent if there is no disclosed relationship between the inventions, that is, there are unconnected in design, operation, and effect. *See* M.P.E.P. § 806.6. However, the claims in the invention are related and share similarities in design, operation and effect.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the examination of all the claims does not impose a serious burden. Claims 1-52 relate to methods for automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone. Moreover, the claims relate to detecting and selecting a log deleting management database from a menu in the mobile phone.

Since Groups I, II, and III are similar and recite common inventive features, again the Applicants believe that it will not be a serious burden on the Examiner to search and examine all of the claims. "If the search and examination of all claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinction inventions." *See* M.P.E.P. § 803.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 39, 42, 44-46, 49 and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamimura. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Kamimura does not disclose or teach "preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call," as recited in claim 39.

Kamimura discloses a communication apparatus comprising a telephone directory that stores a plurality of data sets including a name, a telephone number, e-mail address, image pattern numbers, a ring tone number, a background color number, and a vibrating pattern. The communication apparatus comprises a display unit for displaying a telephone number read out from the telephone directory and data such as an e-mail message or images. The communication apparatus also comprises an editing function for editing data stored in the telephone directory and an informing function for informing of an incoming call in accordance with data stored in the telephone directory when the communication apparatus receives an incoming call. (See paragraphs [0047] and [0052]). Ring tones, a background color pattern number, images and a vibrating pattern number can be stored in the telephone directory in correspondence with each telephone number. (See paragraphs [0042] – [0044]). When the communication apparatus receives an incoming call signal, personal data from the telephone directory corresponding to caller ID information is retrieved. The control unit of the communication apparatus reads the personal data from the telephone directory and the display unit displays personal images corresponding to the personal data including the name and number of the calling party (see paragraphs [0065]-[0069]).

Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing in the reference, as alleged by the Examiner, that discloses or teaches “preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call,” since the display unit of Kamimura displays personal images corresponding to the personal data including the name and number of the calling party when an incoming call signal is received. Likewise, Kumagai does not supply at least the above-noted deficiencies of Kamimura.

In view of the above arguments, Kamimura does not disclose or teach the claimed elements of independent claim 39. Therefore, the rejection of claim 39 should be withdrawn. The rejection of independent claim 46, which discloses a second mobile phone that prevents the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call, should

be withdrawn for at least the same reasons given above with regard to claim 39. The rejection of dependent claims 40, 41, 43-55, and 47, 48, and 50-52, which incorporate the limitations of respective base claims 39 and 46, should also be withdrawn at least based on the above arguments.

With respect to dependent claims 42 and 49, the Examiner alleges that Kamimura discloses receiving mail associated with the input number in a private voice mailbox, the private voice mailbox being separate from the general mailbox, by referencing paragraphs [0045] – [0052]. However, based on our review of Kamimura, there is nothing in the reference that discloses a voice mailbox, private mailbox or a general mailbox. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 42 and 49 should be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 40, 41, 43, 47, 48 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura in view of Kumagai.

In view of the arguments given above with regard to claims 39 and 46, Kumagai does not supply at least the above-noted deficiencies of Kamimura. Therefore, the rejection of dependent claims 40, 41, 43, 47, 48 and 50, which incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims 39 and 46, should be withdrawn at least based on the above arguments.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that such arguments are fully responsive to the Office Action dated July 5, 2006 and respectfully requests the asserted grounds of rejections be withdrawn based on such arguments.

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Demetra Smith-Stewart".

Demetra Smith-Stewart
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 47,354

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
(202) 659-9076

Dated: October 3, 2006